REMARKS

The Final Office Action mailed January 16, 2008 considered claims 1-3, 5-14, 17-24, 26-29, and 32-35. Claim 29 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Claims 1-3, 5-7, and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Fieres et al. (US 6,178,504) hereinafter *Fieres*. Claims 8-13, 17-24, 26-29, and 32-35 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Fieres*, and further in view of de Jong et al. (US 2004/0054628) hereinafter *de Jong*.[1]

As a preliminary matter, Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for the courtesies extended during the telephonic interview held April 15, 2008. Details of that interview are included herein below.

By this paper, claims 1, 14, 17, 29, have been amended[2], claims 5, 10 have been cancelled, and new claim 36 has been added, such that claims 1, 2, 6-9, 11-14, 17-24, 26-29, 32-36 remain pending in the application, of which only claims 1, 14, 17 and 29 are independent claims.

The present application is generally directed to encrypting and decrypting messages using tokens generated by value types, where the value types include collections of executable instructions for data handling, including instructions that tell a computer system how to read data associated with a specific security token that was created using a specific value type. In particular, independent claims 1 and 14 are directed to computer systems that receive data encrypted using these specialized security tokens, whereas independent claims 17 and 29 are directed to systems that send messages using the specialized tokens. Further, it should be noted as well that claim 1 additionally includes deserializing portions of the message including portions of the message that include security tokens created using the one or more value types. Also, claim 1 includes recitations with regards to portions of a message that are not serialized including destination information such that intermediate computer systems do not need to deserialize the message.

---

[1] Although the prior art status of the cited art is not being challenged at this time, Applicant reserves the right to challenge the prior art status of the cited art at any appropriate time, should it arise. Accordingly, any arguments and amendments made herein should not be construed as acquiescing to any prior art status of the cited art.

[2] Support for the amendments can be found throughout the specification, but with particularity at paragraphs [0015], [0035], [0036], [0041] and [0042].

The art cited in the preset Office Action fails to disclose each and every element of the claims as now recited. In particular, each of the independent claims was rejected under 35 USC 102 as being anticipated by *Fieres*. However, *Fieres* fails at least to show security tokens created using the value type as is now recited by the claims of the present application as well as value types as now defined in the claims of the present application. *Fieres* is directed to providing the ability to ship worldwide cryptographic capabilities. See *Fieres* at Abstract. The Office Action at page 4 appears to equate the classes of service disclosed in *Fieres* with the value types claimed in the present application. While the value types of the present application are defined as including collection of executable instructions for data handling, including instructions that tell a computer system how to read data associated with a specific security token (also note that new claim 36 recites that a value type includes compiled instructions), and that the security token is created using the value type, *Fieres* teaches that the classes of service "consist of a COS identifier...and a descriptive part which contains the identifier of the associated method and constraints which must be evaluated before access to the method is granted. Col. 11, lines 13-19. *Fieres* does not appear to teach that the classes of service include instructions that tell a computer system how to read data associated with a specific security token that was created using the value type.

Additionally, *Fieres* seems to be silent with respect to teaching that the classes of service create security tokens. In contrast, *Fieres* teaches that the classes of service themselves may be considered to be security tokens (see e.g. *Fieres* at col. 13, lines 29-30), but does not appear to teach that the classes of service create security tokens. *deJong* does not compensate for the deficiencies of *Fieres* in this respect.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that the other rejections to the claims are now moot and do not, therefore, need to be addressed individually at this time. It will be appreciated, however, that this should not be construed as Applicant acquiescing to any of the purported teachings or assertions made in the last action regarding the cited art or the pending application, including any official notice. Instead, Applicant reserves the right to challenge any of the purported teachings or assertions made in the last action at any appropriate time in the future, should the need arise. Furthermore, to the extent that the Examiner has relied on any Official Notice, explicitly or implicitly, Applicant specifically requests that the Examiner

provide references supporting the teachings officially noticed, as well as the required motivation or suggestion to combine the relied upon notice with the other art of record.

In the event that the Examiner finds remaining impediment to a prompt allowance of this application that may be clarified through a telephone interview, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney at (801) 533-9800.

Dated this 16th day of May, 2008.

Respectfully submitted,

RICK D. NYDEGGER
Registration No. 28,651
J. LAVAR OLDHAM
Registration No. 53,409
Attorneys for Applicant
Customer No. 47973

RDN:JLO:aam
CRB0000008215V001